

Saturday, April 6th 1991

Today's Topics:

Re: Gravitational magnetism  
Belgian reports  
Re: Bill Cooper  
(none)  
Kecksburg UFO Crash  
Re: Rick Redux  
Re: Statements of accepta  
Re: Fcc Modem Charge  
Re: Mail Problems  
Skeptics  
Fiery Objects Fall on Northern Texas  
Re: THEY'RE HERE!!!!  
KOA  
Re: Bill Cooper  
Re: Serios Business

---

From: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Tender)

Subject: Re: Gravitational magnetism

Date: 30 Mar 91 09:57:42 GMT

>> Robert Forward, a physicist specializing  
>> in gravitational theory and 'hard SF' writer (Dragon's  
>> Egg and sequel), has described an antigravity device  
>> consisting of a toroidal coil with an ID of about  
>> 100 meters.  
>>  
>> If the mass of a neutron star were to flow through the  
>> windings of the coil every millisecond, the magnetic

KL> Not possible. The constraints of even a superconductor  
KL> to handle that many electrons per millisecond dictate a  
KL> conductor wider than the toroid itself. That's my  
KL> hip-pocket assessment without knowing the mass of the  
KL> neutron star involved.

I got the impression that the mass goes through the toroid, not the coils.

>> enormous masses and velocities required is the low  
>> value of the gravitational coupling constant  
>> (about 40 orders of magnitude less than the strong  
>> nuclear or EM)

KL> Wrong! 40 orders of magnitude places this "reaction"  
KL> above Planck energy values, an unexplored region if not

KL> virgin territory by human instrumentation(s) that one  
KL> might consider possible billionths of a second after the  
KL> creation of the (now reckoned) universe.  
KL>  $10^{19}$  to  $10^{28}$  is more likely the region that we could  
KL> measure "gravitons" at, if superstring theory is valid.

What are "Planck energy values"? Where did you get the numbers  
 $10^{19}$  to  $10^{28}$ ?

The  $10^{40}$  value for comparative field strength of the EM force over the gravitational force comes from a comparison of the field strengths for specific particles. In a model of the hydrogen atom, assuming a proton-electron distance of  $5.3e-11$  meter, the EM force between the two particles is  $8.1e-8$  newtons while the gravitational force is only  $3.7e-47$  newtons. This yields about a  $10^{40}$  ratio, and since both fields have an inverse square dependence on distance, the ratio is invariant for particle separation. As most of the charged particles in the universe are protons and electrons, this is not an inappropriate comparison. However, even if you substitute another proton for the electron, the ratio is only reduced to about  $10^{37}$ .

>> and the low permeability of space to the field.  
>> Physicists at Stanford and elsewhere are  
>> planning experiments on a satellite in the next decade  
>> to test for the existence of the rotational field.

KL> I'll have to look this term up, never heard it before.

It's new to me too. Let me know what you find.

... from the purlieus of Pittsburgh

--  
John Tender - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: John.Tender@f112.n129.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: John.Hicks@p2.f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)  
Subject: Belgian reports  
Date: 31 Mar 91 00:13:00 GMT

An interesting little tidbit from the International Literary Gazette (reprinted by UFONS) in an interview by Oleg Moroz of Ivan Tretyak, CIC USSR ADF.

MOROZ. "The Belgian Air Force headquarters published some excerpts from a report which gave an account of the events that occurred on the night of March 30: It was at last officially confirmed that the mysterious black triangles that had for seven months recurrently

appeared over Belgium were detected by military radars."

TRETYAK. "I know about this publication. But the fact is that several days later it was refuted; there had been no detection by radars."

Have we missed a followup somewhere? Throughout the interview, Tretyak seems to be a fairly straightforward guy.

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: John.Hicks@p2.f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 4 Apr 91 00:55:00 GMT

Don; I was just pulling the leg a little when I mention Las Vegas. If we can you the team Alien as some other race that is not of the planet earth, then I would say that YES there is prove that we are being visited by Aliens. Check in Wendelle Stevens back room and you will see over 3,500 pictures of these crafts that they are using. Ask the 20,000,000 people that have seen something that does not look or act like anything that is know on this earth.

You being a retired police investigator would not have any problem sending a person to death if you had the data that exist on UFO's. If our courts demanded more prove then what we have collected over the pass 40+ years then we might as well lay off ever police officer and close all prisons. I have to go now because I got to give a lecture on UFO's in about 1 hour to our local Amateur Radio Club. I ask for a rebuttal when the 2 months ago a lawyer gave a talk on the subject and said that because the speed of light is the fastest thing know to man and the nearest star that might support life is x mount of years and it would take this long to get from point a to b, there for there is no such thing as UFO's. Believe me someone is going to hang tonight because I am going to show them some prove. 73's ---Jim---

--

Jim Greenen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: psuvm.psu.edu!CCB104  
Subject: (none)  
Date: 5 Apr 91 04:30:45 GMT

From: <CCB104@psuvm.psu.edu>

(I am sending you this on behalf of T. Scott Crain, Jr.)

- - The original note follows - -

- - Standard disclaimers apply - -

From: T. Scott Crain, Jr.  
Subject: Kecksburg UFO Crash

Perhaps Paranet subscribers should not be so quick to write off the Kecksburg UFO crash, as would be the upshot of a recent article by Robert Young for the Spring 1991 Skeptical Inquirer (Info-Paranet Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 380). It appears Young has a knack for filtering out facts that don't parallel his preconceived notions about what really happened that night on December 9, 1965.

Stan Gordon, Director of the Pennsylvania Association for the Study of the Unexplained (PASU), is an active investigator of the Kecksburg crash and has compiled a mountain of evidence that supports the notion that a bronze-colored, acorn-shaped object, approximately 12 feet long and 10 feet in diameter, with a band of unintelligible markings wrapped around it, crash-landed in a wooded area near Kecksburg, Pennsylvania.

After seeing Young's article in Info-Paranet Newsletter, I phoned Gordon on March 31, 1991, and we discussed his ongoing investigation as well as Young's article.

First of all, Young dismisses what witnesses claim they saw, simply because they did not come forward sooner. Gordon has interviewed at least 4 witnesses who saw the object while it was on the ground (and, to be sure, before the military had secured the crash site area). They include one fireman (one of several who saw it that day) and three civilians. These witnesses are not looking for publicity and will not let Gordon release their names to the media for fear of ridicule. Gordon explained to me how witnesses who didn't know each other took him to the same crash site. Witnesses' descriptions of the craft were virtually identical, during separate interviews conducted by PASU.

Young points out in his article that during the alleged UFO recovery operation, Jerome and Valerie Miller's home was portrayed as a 'military command post' in the re-enactment appearing on NBC's 'Unsolved Mysteries' episode on the crash (Sept. 19, 1990). The Miller's deny their home was a command center for the military, and so does Stan Gordon, who told me that another home in the vicinity of the crash was the command post.

Young hints that a secret satellite was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, that same day, and the stage was set for Kecksburg. Never mind that scientist Ivan T. Sanderson traced the flight pattern of the UFO and discovered it made a controlled 25-degree turn in Ohio and headed for Pennsylvania (Fate Magazine, arch 1966). Not a typical movement of a satellite crashing back to Earth.

Young also hints that the object may have been a brilliant bolide or 'fireball' that was observed coming down from Canada and a half dozen or so states before crash-landing. But he failed to mention that Sanderson estimated the object's speed at 1062.5 miles per hour. PASU did a detailed analysis of the observations and times the object was seen and concluded that at most the object was moving at a speed of 5257 miles per hour. Neither estimate comes anywhere near the minimum speed for a meteor which is approximately 27,000 miles per hour. Witnesses to the Kecksburg UFO said it was 'gliding in' before it crashed and moving at the speed of a small plane.

Finally, Young concludes from old newspaper accounts that really nothing fell in Kecksburg. Young reports 'the Air Force also announced that nothing had been found' (Pittsburgh Press, Dec. 10). Yet, Project Bluebook records I have in my hands indicate the Air Force concluded the object was a meteor, which we have already determined is virtually impossible. Anyhow, why would numerous local fire companies, the Pennsylvania State Police, the U.S. Air Force, the 662nd Radar Squadron, and various other military officials gravitate to the village of Kecksburg to recover a rock from space? What happened to this alleged meteor? Why did it have to be removed that night? And why all the secrecy?

Young reports: 'The official explanations are totally consistent with all published accounts and the present recollections of scores of witnesses.' Obviously, Young has not been talking to the same witnesses that Gordon has been talking to. Like the Westmoreland County man who was stationed at Lockbourne Air Base near Columbus, Ohio, who claims the base was put on 'red alert' during the early morning hours of December 10, 1965 (the same morning witnesses at Kecksburg watched a flatbed truck travel towards the crash site and leave with a large object on the back covered with a tarp). According to this former member of the Air Police at Lockbourne, a flatbed truck with a tarpaulin-covered object drove into the hangar and was guarded until 7:30 a.m., when it left for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base 100 miles away.

Several days later, a witness reported seeing the object at Wright-Patterson. Reporter Sharon Santus writing in the Greensburg Tribune-Review (Dec. 9, 1990) writes:

+Another witness, Ohio truck driver John Cummings (not his real name), +said he actually saw the object inside a building at Wright-Patterson +on Dec. 12, 1965, just three days after the alleged landing.  
+  
+Cummings, who made deliveries for a Dayton-area building-supply company, +said a high-ranking military officer arrived at the firm on Dec. 11,

+1965, and ordered a special radiation-, moisture-resistant brick for  
+construction of a protective room inside a building at Wright-Patterson.  
+

+Cummings said he and a cousin delivered 6,500 bricks to Wright-Patterson  
+the next day after being instructed by their boss not to discuss  
+anything they might observe at the compound.

+

+ 'We were unloading the bricks onto pallets and me and my cousin decided  
+to sneak inside to see what all the secrecy was about,' Cummings said.  
+'Guards immediately ordered us out ... but not before we saw it.'

+

+ Cummings said he saw a dark bronze, bell-shaped object about 14 feet  
+wide at the base and about 12 feet high.

+

+ He said scaffolding surrounded the object, which was covered on three  
+sides with parachute-like material that hung from the ceiling. According  
+to Cummings, 10 to 15 men with white, protective suits, wearing rubber  
+boots, rubber gloves and gas masks were attempting to open the object.

+

+ 'They took us outside and told us to forget what we had seen,' Cummings  
+said, 'We were told that in 20 years, the object would be common  
+knowledge.'

+

+ Cummings said that a few days later he learned that other truck drivers  
+had seen a flatbed military truck with a tarpaulin-covered object on the  
+back traveling from the Pittsburgh area west on Route 40 toward  
+Wheeling, W.Va., and then on to Columbus and Dayton.

+

+ He said that information along with his own experience convinces him  
+that the object he saw at Wright-Patterson was the same as that which  
+allegedly fell in Kecksburg.

As one can see, there is more to this case than Young has reported in  
his article. At the close of my conversation with Gordon, he said that  
he was not saying it's an alien spacecraft (that's only one possibility);  
it could be a sophisticated military probe of an undetermined origin.  
But something landed that day in Kecksburg, and whatever it was, it  
attracted the interest of the military.

- - End of message from T. Scott Crain, Jr. - -

---

From: John.Cockrell@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (John Cockrell)  
Subject: Re: Rick Redux  
Date: 4 Apr 91 22:46:00 GMT

Musta missed that one. What'd he say?

Just wonderin',  
J.C.

--  
John Cockrell - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: John.Cockrell@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: Re: Statements of accepta  
Date: 4 Apr 91 21:16:00 GMT

> I am looking for statements they have committed to print and public  
> distribution; if no single definitive statements are available, then  
> maybe a few relevant citations. If you have some files of personal  
> conversations, I'm interested but I'd rather have "official" statements  
> in their own words.

Sorry; can't really help you there. I do believe that the statements you seek exist in many places, most notably the Skeptical Inquirer, but I couldn't cite you specific references.

> Such statements would be quite valuable. It would at least show how  
> competent these guys are as scientists (assuming they would actually  
> write their own stuff) as opposed to propagandists.

It is my impression that these guys are competent "scientific thinkers." (Define "scientist.") I am not by any stretch of the imagination a "scientist", but I believe I've got a grasp on how the thinking process goes. While I disagree with their parameters for evidence, I recognize that there is enough room for gentlemanly debate on the subject without stooping to the degree of vilification you seem to revel in. The bottom line is, I \*do\* believe that "these guys" will accept \*SOMETHING\* solid as evidence, and though they do seem to present a moving target, I believe that, if UFOs are a genuine, physical phenomenon, it is within our power to gather the requisite amount of evidence to convince them. Of course, with some of them, it becomes almost academic, since a sufficiently large body of evidence has indeed already been gathered.

> I never said Rick or anyone should delete any files. I did say that  
> if we are going to categorize these files, as "good" or "bad" or  
> "Cooper-like" etc., we should have explicitly stated (as opposed to  
> implicitly assumed) ~reasons~ for doing so. I opposed the idea that such  
> file deletions should be made at the whim of a sysop. This is both  
> consistent with and required of a scientific approach to the UFO  
> phenomena.

>  
> When Rick, a member of the Bay Area Skeptics and CSICOP, evaded  
> this issue so persistently it merely reinforced a pattern I've seen in  
> skeptics before; using science when it is convenient, and ignoring it  
> otherwise.

<sigh> I have seen that pattern in skeptics myself. I just don't see it in Rick, and I don't think you should be painting with such a broad brush.

Jim

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Shaffer)  
Subject: Re: Fcc Modem Charge  
Date: 5 Apr 91 07:42:00 GMT

I don't blame you Mike, I "posted in haste" to say the least, the first time I read the article. But then I stopped to think, and I hesitated on sending any nasty letters to the FCC. Good thing, because it was debunked a few weeks later. (I think it was probably around February/March of last year, but I'm not certain. As I said before, it was the same message you posted.)

--

Jim Shaffer - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Shaffer@f4.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: Elizabeth.Anderson@p0.f30.n134.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Elizabeth Anderson)  
Subject: Re: Mail Problems  
Date: 4 Apr 91 01:51:00 GMT

Ok, here's the information again. Everybody please note, however, I am at a very remedial level with computers, and I don't keep copies of messages I send, ok?

It is called the Nahanni (two 'n's) National Park. Established 1972. Covers 4700 square kms. The river is 320 kms long. There are gorges over 1000 m deep, and there is a falls, over 100 m deep (or high, I suppose) called Virginia Falls.

32 mammal species; 120 bird species. UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Nearest service point - Fort Simpson, N.W.T.; write to their Board of Trade or Chamber of Commerce for information.

As for the headless prospectors, they were looking for gold - but maybe they found it, maybe they didn't.....

All the best, and good luck! Let me know if you need more info.

Elizabeth

--

Elizabeth Anderson - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Elizabeth.Anderson@p0.f30.n134.z1.FIDONET.ORG

---

From: gross@dg-rtp.dg.com (Gene Gross)  
Subject: Skeptics  
Date: 5 Apr 91 14:56:44 GMT

>From gross@dg-rtp.dg.com (Gene Gross)

The only problem with being open-minded is that your brains may fall out. <GRIN!!>

Okay, enough clowning for a moment. Look, Rick and other skeptics serve a very valid and useful purpose in any investigation of things that the rationalist tends to see as outside the 'natural laws.' They demand of all of us far better work and documentation of the evidence. And as irritating as their constant questioning can be, it should be the spur in the flank that moves us onward. No amount of belief makes up for sloppy scholarship and research.

By the same token, skepticism for the mere sake of being skeptical is an unworthy effort. This is not to accuse any individual of this practice. One of the problems that I've had with the rationalist school is that much of the philosophical positions tend to be self-defeating. But this is not the place for an extensive discourse on Hume and others.

Rick, has often asked very good questions that deserve good, or better answers. He has shown the weakness of some thinking and positions. For this, we ought to tip our hat to him.

One thing though, Rick, offering an alternative explanation of an event does not disprove the event or the other explanation. Also, I wonder how many skeptics form their arguments as follows:

P = premise  
C = conclusion

P: Since UFOs do not exist,

C: there cannot be any evidence that they do exist.  
P: Since there cannot be any evidence for UFOs' existence,  
C: all evidences for UFOs must be somehow false.  
P: Since all evidences for UFOs are false,  
C: UFOs do not exist.

Again, this is not a personal accusation. However, I have been interested in the comments of many skeptics that, regardless of the evidence, UFOs are impossible. I remain skeptical that UFOs are what some think they are, but I do acknowledge that something is happening to people that cannot be accounted for by a natural explanation. At that point I have to stop because I do not have enough information and evidence to make a definitive statement.

Nonetheless, keep it up, Rick.

Gene Gross

---

From: neptune.convex.com!swarren  
Subject: Fiery Objects Fall on Northern Texas  
Date: 5 Apr 91 18:54:05 GMT

From: swarren@neptune.convex.com (Steve Warren)

This was in today's (Friday 4/5/91) issue of The Dallas Morning News (bottom of page 21A).

In light of the recent discussions regarding sightings of fireballs, I thought some of the Paranet readers would find it interesting, so I typed in the article this morning.

Enjoy:

---

SIRENS GO OFF; NO ONE KNOWS WHY  
Teletype, 'Fiery Objects' in Sky Add to Mystery

By Todd Copilevitz and Nita Thurman  
Staff Writer of The Dallas Morning News

A cryptic Teletype about a ground fire and 'fiery objects' falling from the sky - followed by civil defense sirens apparently sounding off on their own - had Dallas officials humming the theme from The Twilight Zone on Thursday.

Beginning at 1:47 a.m., the 911 switchboard was flooded with phone calls from residents in the Eastern third of the city wanting to know the reason for the sirens.

Authorities wanted to know, too.

Computer tapes did not show that anyone had triggered the sirens - or even that they were sounding, said Bobby J. Martinez, assistant director of Dallas' Office of Emergency Preparedness.

But three minutes before the sirens went off, police received a Teletype from the North American Aerospace Defense Command, which monitors the skies for falling objects such as enemy missiles and space debris.

The message - first sent to the Texas Department of Public Safety in Austin, then relayed to police departments, read:

'Report from national warning center on hot spot or possible ground fire 28 miles North of Longview. Are attempting to locate fire now. At approximately same time national warning center received reports of fiery objects falling from sky east of Oklahoma City. Are investigating a possible correlation of the two sightings. Request any agency receiving similar reports forward information to DPS Austin communications.'

Moments later, according to telephone logs, people started calling about the sirens.

'This place was going nuts,' said one police communications worker. 'They kept expecting Rod Serling to step out of the corner,' she said, referring to the host of the old *Twilight Zone* television show.

Mr. Martinez said the city's 94 sirens can be turned on only by the watch commander at the police communications center or the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

'Dallas police do not indicate that they sounded the sirens, and we weren't even in the office at that time,' he said.

There is no way for a teletype to trigger the 127-decibel sirens automatically, Mr. Martinez said.

Police and emergency preparedness officials tried to turn the sirens off, but with limited success.

The sirens went back on as many as three times before Mr. Martinez's office disabled the city's entire system at 3:00 a.m.

'It became obvious that the system was not going to reset on its own, so our only choice was to disable it,' he said.

NORAD officials said they had issued the teletype about midnight Dallas time. Apparently there was a delay in transmission of the message from the DPS in Austin to local police.

Meanwhile, the bright objects mentioned in the NORAD Teletype were reported by residents across North Texas.

Mike Ames, 25, of The Colony (a city in the North Dallas area - SW) said he was jogging in a rural area when he saw a ball of fire streak across the sky from northwest to southeast sometime after 9 p.m.

'I thought it was a satellite coming down,' he said. 'I thought I was going to get hit by some debris.'

'I could see flames coming off ...and it had this big tale.'

A fisherman on Lake Whitney, 35 miles north of Waco, called the National Weather Service in Fort Worth to report that the whole lake lit up and debris fell everywhere, said a weather service spokesman.

'We had three or four calls here from people wondering what the light was,' said meteorologist Jesse Moore. 'All we can say is it wasn't weather-related.'

As for the report of a ground fire in northeast Texas, Upshur County deputies said a thorough search turned up nothing.

'They couldn't locate anything,' said sheriff's Capt. Nancy Betterton. 'There just wasn't anything there.'

In addition to plenty of mystery, Mr. Martinez said the episode provided one benefit:

'At least we know now that the sirens are loud enough to wake people if necessary.'

-----  
--Steve .\_||\_. DISCLAIMER: All opinions are my own.  
Warren v\ \*|-----  
V {uunet,sun}!convex!swarren; swarren@convex.com

-----

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: Re: THEY'RE HERE!!!!  
Date: 5 Apr 91 14:10:00 GMT

> They're Here!

And they look like the Michelin Tire Man!

--  
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

-----

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: KOA  
Date: 5 Apr 91 14:11:00 GMT

How did the KOA appearance go?

--  
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

-----

From: neptune.convex.com!swarren  
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
Date: 6 Apr 91 00:18:51 GMT

From: swarren@neptune.convex.com (Steve Warren)

+From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)  
+Subject: Re: Bill Cooper  
+Date: 26 Mar 91 14:10:01 GMT

[...]

+ ... Now, If you had a dramatic sighting (and I also  
+had one) wouldn't you have the tendency to throw all skepticism out  
+and look toward the reasons of who, how, what and where questions? I  
+did that many years ago and now I am looking for the answers to  
+those questions.

+ You mention that you are skeptic but skeptic of what? If you were  
+referring to Mr. Cooper, you have good reason but to the existence of  
+aliens visiting this planet, you should not have any doubt. ...

On what grounds? Just because I experience a dramatic sighting does not mean that aliens are visiting us! What did I really see? How many conclusions can I draw from my experience? Does everything that is bizarre (beyond anything I've experienced before) necessarily come from outside of our planet? Certainly I have no extra-planetary experiences that would give me the ability to actually judge whether something originated from outside of planet Earth.

And I'm not saying aliens are not visiting us. But really, we are trying to discover what the reality of this phenomenon is, and just deciding that it is aliens visiting this planet is not helpful!

Why not? Because there are a number of alternative theories that taken together could explain everything that has been reported. Some of these theories include intentional hoaxes and mental/emotional instability, suggestability (in the case of hypnotic regression), gov't disinformation for unknown purposes (possibly using UFO reports to explain/discredit sightings of supersecret technology developed by the gov't), etc.

Again, let me stress, I am not saying that there are no aliens. I am just saying that when you want to get to the bottom of something it is not productive to decide in advance that you already know what has happened.

In order to actually say, as Jim says here, 'you should not have any doubt,' (and actually be right) you *\*must\** have some kind of verifiable evidence that *\*distinguishes\** between these theories. IE you need to have evidence that clearly eliminates Earthly technology, as well as hoaxes, delusions or hallucinations.

There is also the less-popular alternate theory that says that the explanation for ufos is 'spiritual,' that is, only a small part of the manifestations are actually physical, and everything else is spectral (manipulations of light/ radar/magnetism/etc by 'spirit' or extra-dimensional creatures who have some bizarre otherworldly purpose for 'spooking' us on a regular basis). This theory would be dealt a serious blow by the recovery of a working alien spacecraft. ;^)

All these various explanations are clamoring for attention, and no one has yet presented the definitive evidence that justifies any one theory to the exclusion of all the rest. Until the definitive evidence appears, it is silly to accuse people of being closed minded for not embracing one view over another. In reality the closed-minded ones are the people like Jim here, who has already made up his mind that one theory is 'it'; it's the answer. The truth is, there are other theories that are just as likely to

be the correct explanation, if not more so.

To me open-minded means being open to \*all\* the plausible explanations, and remaining neutral even towards the more silly explanations. You can't narrow the field until the actual evidence is sufficient to eliminate the other contenders.

--Steve .\_||\_. DISCLAIMER: All opinions are my own.  
Warren v\ \*|-----  
V {uunet,sun}!convex!swarren; swarren@convex.com

---

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)  
Subject: Re: Serios Business  
Date: 5 Apr 91 14:09:00 GMT

OK, Dan, you've convinced me. I shall look for the much-vaunted \*second edition\* of the World of Ted Serios.

In the meantime, I shall review Martin Gardner's "Science: Good, Bad and Bogus" and may excerpt a few things from it for your reading "pleasure." Mind you, I'm no great fan of Gardner's, and if I run something of his up the flagpole, its because I'm really hoping it can be shot down - personally I think the guy is the most pompous of the CSICOP hit-men. But I will be looking for bulls-eyes on Eisenbud's part.

Jim  
--  
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

\*\*\*\*\*To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to\*\*\*\*\*  
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara  
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com  
ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com  
{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

\*\*\*\*\*The\*\*End\*\*of\*\*Info-ParaNet\*\*Newsletter\*\*\*\*\*